## REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,371,886 to Britton in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,506 to Cobb. Claims 1-15 have been canceled. Claims 18-33 have been added, leaving claims 16-33 for consideration.

Applicants claim 16 recites "A method for managing a distributed transaction comprising one or more transaction flows between respective pairs of nodes in a network of interconnected nodes, each of said transaction flows being accompanied by an originating node identifier identifying the originating node, said method being performed by one of said nodes as a local node and comprising the steps of:

maintaining a registry comprising zero or more entries corresponding to inbound flows from other nodes, each of said entries containing the originating node identifier accompanying the corresponding inbound flow and a local node identifier identifying the local node, said local node identifier being used to identify the local node in outbound transaction flows to other nodes resulting from said inbound flow;

upon receiving an inbound flow from another node, determining whether there is an entry in said registry for the originating node identifier accompanying said inbound flow;

if there is no entry for said originating node identifier and there is no entry for another inbound flow for the same transaction, creating an entry in said registry containing said originating node identifier and a local node identifier identifying the local node; and

if there is no entry for said originating node identifier and there is an entry for another inbound flow for the same transaction, creating an entry in said registry containing the originating node identifier accompanying said inbound flow and a local node qualifier identifying the local node that is different from any other local node identifier in said registry for that transaction."

POU92000165US1

FAX NO. 8602860115

Assuming, arguendo, that the Cobb reference is generally related to the instant application, it does not teach, alone or in combination with Britten, the features of the applicants claim 16. Specifically, the transaction context of Cobb is not equivalent to the registry recited in claim 16. The registry recited in claim 16 contains entries corresponding to inbound flows from other nodes. Moreover, unlike the instant application, the Cobb reference is directed to nested transactions. Thus, Cobb does not recite a registry comprising zero or more entries corresponding to inbound flows from other nodes...the entries containing the originating node identifier accompanying the corresponding inbound flow and a local node identifier identifying the local node.

Additionally, the transaction context 132 of the Cobb reference does not recite identifying the local node in outbound transaction flows to other nodes resulting from the inbound flow as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, The Applicants submit that the claim 16 is patentable over Cobb. As Britten and Cobb do not teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants claim 16, claim 16 is patentable over these references.

Claim 17 depends from what is an allowable claim 16. For at least this reason, the Applicants submit that claim 17 is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants' newly added claims 18 and 26 recite a method and system for utilizing a path-sensitive branch registry for cyclic distributed transactions including ...a plurality of nodes in a cyclic distribution tree, the plurality of nodes include a superior POU92000165US1

node and subordinate nodes; a flow initiated by the superior node and received by a first of the subordinate nodes, the flow including a global tree identification and a branch qualifier; wherein for each subordinate node in the transaction tree: a registry of the subordinate node is searched for the global tree identification and the branch qualifier; and if the global tree identification and the branch qualifier is not found in the registry a unique transaction branch qualifier is assigned by the subordinate node to the flow; and the flow and the unique transaction branch qualifier is sent by the subordinate node to an other subordinate node.

Neither Britten nor Cobb disclose these features. Specifically, the cited art references do not teach assigning a unique transaction branch qualifier to a subordinate node when a superior node's global tree identification and branch qualifier are not found in the registry of the node. By assigning a unique branch qualifier at each subordinate node through the distributed transaction tree, the cyclic distribution tree becomes acyclic in that the terminating subordinate node is assigned a new branch qualifier than what was originally assigned at the time the flow is received from the superior node at the beginning of the cyclic flow. As Britten and Cobb do not recite these features, the Applicants submit that claims 18 and 26 are in condition for allowance. Claims 19-25 depend from claim 18 and claims 27-33 depend from claim 26. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 19-25 and 27-33 are in condition for allowance.

No new matter has been entered and no additional fees are believed to be required.

However, if any fees are due with respect to this Amendment, please charge them to

Deposit Account No. 09-0463 maintained by Applicants' Assignce.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

Marisa J. Dubuc

Registration No. 46,673 Customer No. 23413

Date:

June 25, 2004

Address:

55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone:

(860) 286-2929